

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated June 23, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 1, 12, 14-19, 30 and 31-36 have been amended, and claims 11, 13, 29 and 31 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection and rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 13-17 and 31-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have incorporated the allowable subject matter of claim 13 into amended independent claim 1, and incorporated the allowable subject matter of allowable claim 31 into amended independent claim 19. Additionally, allowable claims 14-17 have been amended to depend from amended claim 1, and allowable claims 32-35 have been amended to depend from amended claim 19. Accordingly, the objection is overcome.

In the Office Action, claims 1-12 and 19-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2004/0090564, issued to Lee. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Lee fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Lee fails to teach or suggest an array substrate for use in an IPS-LCD device and method of fabricating “wherein the first portion is at an angle with respect to the common fingers, wherein the angle is between about 70 degrees and about 90 degrees” as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 19 of the present application.

Because Lee fails to teach or suggest at least the above allowable features of claims 1 and 19, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-10 and 12, and claim 19 and its dependent claims 20-29 are not anticipated by Lee. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 18 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,839,111, issued to Lee (hereafter "Lee '111"). Claim 18 depends from allowable claim 1, and claim 36 depends from allowable claim 19. By virtue of their dependence from allowable claims 1 and 36, claims 18 and 36 also contain the allowable features discussed above with respect to allowable independent claims 1 and 19. As such, claims 18 and 36 are allowable over Lee and Lee '111. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18 and 36 are respectfully requested.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: September 21, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes  
Valerie P. Hayes  
Registration No.: 53,005  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500